



**MINUTES**  
**Regular Meeting of the**  
**Heritage Preservation Board**  
**Tuesday, February 8, 2011, 7:00 PM**  
**Edina Community Room**  
**4801 50<sup>th</sup> Street West**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chair Joel Stegner, Chris Rofidal, Jean Rehkamp Larson, Bob Schwartzbauer, Arlene Forrest, Claudia Carr, Colleen Curran, Ross Davis, Katherine McLellan and Lauren Thorson

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** None

**STAFF PRESENT:** Joyce Repya, Associate Planner

**INTRODUCTION OF CITY MANAGER, SCOTT NEAL**

Planner Repya introduced City Manager, Scott Neal to the HPB. Mr. Neal shared his background and responded to questions from the group. The Board welcomed Manager Neal to Edina and expressed their desire to work with him for the betterment of the city.

**I. PRESENTATION OF GIFT FROM CLINT & CAROLYN SCHROEDER, 4917 ARDEN AVE.**

Clint & Carolyn Schroeder, long standing residents of the Country Club District presented the Board with a framed poster from the June 20, 1926, *Minneapolis Tribune*, advertising "Thorpe's Country Club District – One of Minneapolis' Most Beautiful Residential Sections". Mrs. Schroeder recalled finding the poster when they moved to their home on Arden Avenue in 1963. The Schroeders' thanked the HPB for the work they have done to preserve the historic integrity of their neighborhood, hoping the poster commemorating the history of the district would find a home in City Hall.

Board members collectively thanked Mr. & Mrs. Schroeder for their thoughtful gift, assuring them that the poster would indeed find a place of honor in the city offices.

**II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES: January 11, 2011**

Member Rofidal moved approval of the minutes from the January 11, 2011 meeting. Member Davis seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

**III. COUNTRY CLUB DISTRICT: Certificates of Appropriateness (COA)**

**A. H-10-03 4623 Bruce Avenue – Change to a COA issued 8-09-2010**

Planner Repya reminded the Board that at their August 2010 meeting they had approved a COA for the subject property that entailed the construction of a new detached garage in the rear yard. The plans approved indicated that the exterior cladding material would be stucco to match the house. Now, the applicant is requesting a change to the exterior materials from stucco to Hard-board stucco panels. The garage would match the home where they plan to also install the Hardi-board stucco panels. As required for a change to an approved COA, the request is being presented to the HPB for approval.

Lon Oberpriller of The Replacement Housing Services Consortium, LLC, contractor for the applicant shared the challenges encountered with unforeseen corrections to the deteriorated infrastructure. Mr. Oberpriller pointed out that once the walls of the home were opened up to add the addition, they encountered rotted rim/floor joists, as well as rotted framing and sheathing hidden between plaster and stucco with serious implications for the overall structural integrity of the home. His comments were documented with photos depicting the rot encountered during the renovation. He added that the mandatory repairs substantially increased the total cost of the project.

Mr. Oberpriller pointed out his awareness that financial considerations cannot drive the decisions of the HPB; however the change in exterior materials from stucco to Hardi-board stucco panels would save the homeowner \$14,500, and relieve a looming financial hardship. Furthermore, Mr. Oberpriller observed that the new Tudor style home constructed at 4602 Bruce Avenue is clad in the same Hardi-board stucco panels, approved by the HPB.

Mr. Oberpriller concluded that the renovation of this home has been an excellent opportunity to understand the actual condition of an 80 year old home in the Country Club District. The interior photos provided prior to the walls being removed demonstrate that while the home looked perfectly sound, the rot inside the walls greatly undermined the health and safety of the home. Mr. Oberpriller then offered to give the Board members a tour of the home at anytime.

### **Board Comments & Vote**

Several Board members asked for clarification on the materials under consideration as well as the colors proposed.

**Member Forrest** thanked Mr. Oberpriller for the thorough documentation of the home's renovation, pointing out that this is a very good example how a home in the Country Club District can be renovated, even with the existence of rot, without tearing it down.

**Member Rofidal** also appreciated the documentation of the project. Adding that it was very instructional; and he looked forward to visiting the home.

**Member Rehkamp Larson** stated that it is a good thing that the form, mass, and scale of the original home have been preserved. She expressed awareness of the financial constraints of the project, pointing out that heritage preservation will always be more expensive than new construction. She also opined that although batten trim is

proposed for the seams of the Hardi-board stucco panel, there are so many seams that the batten trim appears too excessive. Ms. Rehkamp Larson then encouraged Mr. Oberpriller to provide more spacing between the panels, and consider using detail elements such as those used on the home at 4602 Bruce Avenue to provide some relief.

Board members discussed the extent of their review. Planner Repya explained that this COA was the last one they considered that did not include an approval of the addition. That being said, the change request is for the siding on the garage.

**Member Schwartzbauer** observed that the request involves the siding on the garage, however since the HPB requires that the materials of the detached structures match the house, it would be consistent for the house to also be clad in materials to match the new garage.

**Member Davis** moved to approve a change in the exterior cladding of the detached garage from stucco to match the existing house to Hardi-board stucco panels which will also be used on the existing house and addition. Member Curran seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

#### **IV. MORNINGSIDE NEIGHBORHOOD OPEN HOUSE:**

##### **A. Morningside Neighborhood Association – Proposed “Streetcar” Logo**

Planner Repya introduced Helen Burke, 4246 Grimes Avenue and Jennifer Janovy, 4016 Inglewood Avenue, both representing the Morningside Neighborhood Association steering committee. Ms. Janovy explained that Ms. Burke, having attended previous meetings of the HPB had provided the steering committee with a copy of the streetcar logo she had received at the January meeting. Upon viewing the logo, some members of the committee expressed concern that the streetcar was not the best representation of the neighborhood.

Ms. Janovy provided information demonstrating that there are several logos for groups within the neighborhood (Morningside Women’s Club – 1937; Men’s Athletic – 2008; and the Morningside Neighborhood Association – 2005) all sharing a theme centered on nature. She added that the streetcar image is used by the Linden Hills Neighborhood Association, and she would prefer that image not be carried through on Morningside’s street signs.

Ms. Burke clarified that the opinions of the neighborhood association’s steering committee do not necessarily represent the entire neighborhood. She added that she would suggest providing information to the neighborhood; which the steering committee would be happy to facilitate.

Member Forrest thanked Ms. Burke for that clarification, adding that in addition to providing logo options to the steering committee to disseminate, a perfect time to assess the desires of the neighborhood would be at the open house on March 8<sup>th</sup>. On a

cautionary note, Ms. Forrest pointed out that the logos currently used by the neighborhood probably could not be used by the City for the street signs.

Board members discussed possible logos that would tie into both the history of the neighborhood as well as nature. Some ideas included the Catalpa trees along W. 44<sup>th</sup> Street which were brought to Minnesota by Jonathan Grimes; and apples blossoms or the fruit in recognition of the large orchard which made up a great deal of the land that is now Morningside. Board members agreed that the streetcar is an important historic element for the neighborhood which should be included as one of the offerings. The use of a bungalow home was also suggested as a possible logo contender.

Discussion ensued regarding ways to gain input from the neighborhood. Ms. Burke and Janovy agreed that they could help communicate to the members of the neighborhood association through their web site. The Board agreed that would be a great idea. They also discussed providing the choices at the neighborhood open house on March 8<sup>th</sup> with an opportunity for residents to vote on which logo they liked best... 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, etc.

Member Stegner pointed out that the HPB is very open to input from the neighborhood. The intention of the logo on the street sign is to recognize the history of the area, and if the logo can recognize the history utilizing a theme from nature, that would be great. He added that the final decision will be made by the HPB taking into consideration the consensus of the neighborhood. Mr. Rofidal added that whatever is suggested for the logo, must meet criteria that is acceptable to the City's public works department.

Board members thanked Ms. Burke and Ms. Janovy for providing input from the Morningside Neighborhood Association, and added that they look forward to working with them as the history of Morningside is recognized.

### **B. Open House Planning**

Planner Repya explained that because the Morningside Open House will be held prior to the March 8<sup>th</sup> meeting, this is the last opportunity the Board will have to discuss the event. Ms. Repya recalled that a similar open house was provided when the Country Club District Plan of Treatment was presented to the neighborhood, and it was very successful. Because there will be no "presentation", residents are free to stop by the City Hall lobby between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m. to view stations set up to convey information and answer questions.

The Board agreed to include the following stations for the open house:

- Morningside Bungalow Study
  - How to designate ones bungalow a heritage landmark
  - The ramifications of heritage landmark designation
  - Creating the individualized plan of treatment for ones bungalow property
  - A list of the bungalow properties in Morningside
- Morningside Street Sign Logo Selection – Choose your favorite logo (or no logo)
- Morningside Walking Tour – Created in Summer 2010
- Edina Heritage Award information – Nomination Forms

Following a brief discussion, the HPB agreed that they looked forward to meeting with the residents of Morningside at the March 8<sup>th</sup> open house to share the results of the Morningside Bungalow Study, gain interest in heritage landmark designation, and answer community questions.

**V. COMMUNITY COMMENT:** None

**VI. 2011 HERITAGE AWARD PREPARATION:**

Planner Repya provided the Board with a copy of the press release calling for nominations for the 2011 Heritage Award, noting that the deadline for nominations is Wednesday, April 6<sup>th</sup>. Board members briefly discussed potential nominations. All agreed that it would be great to receive a nomination for a mid-century home (built in the 1950's & 1960's), noting that a great deal of the City's architecture falls within that time period. The Board was encouraged to keep their eyes open to potential nominations. No formal action was taken.

**VII. OTHER BUSINESS:**

**A. New Ordinance (proposed) – Special Setback Requirement for Single Dwelling Unit Lots in Edina Heritage Landmark District**

Board members were pleased to see the Planning Commission propose to exempt the properties designated Edina Heritage Landmark from the side yard setback criteria in the Zoning Ordinance.

A question arose regarding the terminology in the proposal which read "With the exception of single dwelling unit lots within the Edina Heritage Landmark District..." Some Board members observed that it appeared that the exemption would only apply to district designations (as in the Country Club District), and not include the individual single dwelling unit (of which there are 3).

Following a brief discussion, Board members agreed that it is important that the exemption would apply to all single dwelling unit lots designated Edina Heritage Landmarks. Member Schwartzbauer moved to suggest the following change to the proposed ordinance, "With the exception of single dwelling unit lots **designated as Edina Heritage Landmarks**," thus removing the term district. Member Rofidal seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

**B. New Ordinance Regarding City Advisory Boards & Commissions**

Planner Repya provided the Board with a copy of the new ordinance for the City's Boards and Commissions which served to compile all of the ordinances for the various groups into one ordinance with an opening section providing general provisions for all. Ms. Repya explained that the City Council has asked each group to review their section and report back any changes or updating they would like to see.

Following a brief discussion, some Board members expressed frustration that they were asked to comment after the code had been completed. Member Stegner commented that he found the general provisions for all boards and commissions under Section 1500 did not thoroughly address how the boards currently function – pointing out that “Advocating for their respective causes” and “Providing public education” should be included. He added that he also felt strongly that the attendance policies should be changed to give attendance credit to all board members in the event a meeting is cancelled.

Member Rofidal observed that under the Heritage Preservation Board’s section No. **1504.05 Membership**, the code currently states the following “**At least one member shall be** a qualified professional historian, architect, architectural historian, archeologist, planner, or the owner of a heritage landmark property.” Rofidal pointed out that considering the important design review responsibilities of the HPB; he would like to see it be mandatory that there be an architect in the make-up of the board. All agreed that would be a good change.

Continuing the discussion regarding section 1504, it was pointed out that item **C. County Historical Society Membership**. “**A member of the Board shall be a member of the Hennepin County Historical Society**” did not appear beneficial to the operation of the HPB. All agreed requiring membership to the Minnesota State Historical Society with whom the HPB works closely, made much more sense.

Member Curran commented that since the new ordinance has been completed, yet the Council is asking for input, perhaps the HPB should let the Council know that the Board believes there are substantive issues that should be addressed.

Planner Repya agreed to compile the comments of the Board, prior to presenting them to the City Council at the upcoming joint meeting.

**C. 2011 Work Plan** – Continued until March meeting.

**VIII. CORRESPONDENCE:** None

**IX. NEXT MEETING DATE:** March 8, 2011

**X. ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting adjourned at 9:50 PM

**Respectfully submitted,**

*Joyce Repya*